

## SCHOOL BOARD ROW

All Aired Before District Subcommittee.

## SEVERAL ARE CALLED LIARS

Dismissed Teachers Called On for Statements—Committee Members Express Their Opinion of the Situation—Bitter and Excited Statements Made by Members of Board.

The hearing on Washington school matters before the education subcommittee of the House District Committee yesterday was as good as a day at Donnybrook Fair. The big room of the District Committee was crowded with dismissed teachers and many citizens interested in the schools. Gen. Morrell presided, and with him sat Messrs. Greene, Sliep, Pou, and McLain. Gen. Morrell being detained from the Capitol for the first hour, Mr. Greene conducted the hearing. The proceedings were marked by bitter comment on various officials and almost constant recrimination. In several cases the lie direct was given. When Mr. Oyster asked what animus there was behind the Greene bill, Mr. Greene told him "it was none of his business." When Dr. Chancellor and Admiral Baird said they had offered Mrs. Cooper another place, after dismissing her from her old one, she said no such offer had been made. When two teachers said they had called at Admiral Baird's house on a certain occasion, the admiral jumped up and said the statement was false.

Mr. Greene made a brief statement, saying he had not heard his bill criticized except indirectly through the newspapers. No one had come directly to him about it, and he said he hoped that, now there was a hearing, every one interested would take the chance to express his or her views. The members of the school board, numerous teachers, and other citizens were present in the large committee room of the District Committee, on the west front of the Capitol. Scores of these present had to stand, and remained there with undiminished interest to the finish.

When Mr. Greene asked if there was any one present who was opposed to the Greene bill, Admiral Baird arose, and said he was present not exactly in opposition to it, but to advise about it. "I came," said he, "to ask Congress to lighten the burden of the board of education."

"My idea," said Mr. Greene, "was to restore rights to those deprived of them. There was no dispute in this committee, in the House, in the Senate, or in conference committee, as to the intent and purpose of the bill not to disturb the teaching force on the rolls when it was passed. But when at my home this past summer I learned that what appears to me to be violation of the law had occurred."

"And I want it understood that this bill was not framed particularly in the interest of colored teachers, but for all the teachers—every one of them. If one teacher has been summarily removed, due to misunderstanding of the law, others might well be treated in the same manner. Moreover, I want to say that this bill was not drawn in any spirit of antagonism to the public schools. It was drawn to protect the law."

"In the first place," said Admiral Baird, "beginning his statement, 'a vigorous enforcement of the law is essential to good government. You have provided in this bill that no employee of the board of education shall be disciplined unless with five days' previous notice.'"

Admiral Baird objected decidedly to the clause of the Greene bill requiring five days' notice before an employee could be disciplined, and Mr. Greene admitted that some amendment to that clause might be desirable.

When Mr. James F. Oyster took the seat at the head of the big table, he said his statement, his first remark was: "What prompted this bill?"

This angered Mr. Greene, who turned red in the face and brought his fist down on the table with emphasis as he replied: "None of your business. I am not here to be questioned by you. I tell you very plainly that it is none of your business."

**Board in Embarrassment.** Mr. Oyster, when quiet had been resumed, asked the board to do things that were desired, but had withheld power. He said he had brought up at the first board meeting the question whether teachers were to be kept in, and was told that it was a legal question. For six weeks he said the board went from the Commissioners to the courts, the President, and the Attorney General to find out what their duty was. Supt. Chancellor then got from the school authorities a list of the "good" teachers, the "fair," and the "poor."

"I think," said Mr. Oyster, "there were only two on the whole list who were not recommended for appointment. One was Mrs. Cooper, who had absolutely no ability as principal of the M Street High School, owing to her lack of executive ability. We offered her another place at \$1,500, or \$100 more than she had been getting."

"Have you any record of the board of education," asked Mr. Greene, "which will show that Mrs. Cooper was in fact offered another position?"

Mr. Oyster said Mrs. Cooper was dismissed because she would not take the place offered her. Admiral Baird and Superintendent Chancellor tried to make statements at this point, but were checked by Mr. Greene. Later Admiral Baird said: "We all held Mrs. Cooper in high esteem, but the efficiency of the school was impaired by her inefficiency as principal. But we did not wish to dismiss her, but to put somebody else in charge of the school. So we made her an offer of another position paying \$100 a year more."

"What was the date of that offer?" "I can't tell just when. It was done verbally."

In the running fire of questions and answers that ensued, Mr. Greene asked what was done in the case of Mr. Swartzell, of the Eastern High School, and Mr. Oyster said he had declined an appointment as teacher of Latin.

Representative Morrell here came in and took up the questioning of the witness. Mr. Greene asked if the board had sought the advice of Assistant District Attorney McNamara when the teachers were dismissed. Mr. Oyster said the board had done so, and Gen. Morrell asked them if Mr. Oyster did not think teachers should

have the benefit of counsel before the board. Mr. Oyster said they ought to when on trial.

**Teachers Heard From.** Gen. Morrell then asked the dismissed teachers present to state if they had made formal application to the board for trial and investigation. Robert Love, formerly of the M Street High School, said that he had done so, but Supt. Chancellor had seemed to have no knowledge why his name had not come before the board for reappointment. Mrs. Mary Nolle, a colored teacher, formerly of the M Street High School, said she had applied for a hearing on her case, and Mr. Swartzell, formerly of the Eastern High School, stated that on September 1 he had gone to Supt. Chancellor's to inquire about his case, because he had seen a statement in the papers that Mr. Chancellor had said he would investigate the Swartzell case before acting. He said that Mr. Chancellor said he had never met him, and that he had never been opposed to making any further investigation of the matter.

Mrs. Cooper, the former principal of the M Street High School, then stated that she had been called by Supt. Chancellor or by the board of education of any place in the school system. This statement was such a direct contradiction of statements made by Admiral Baird and Mr. Oyster that it caused a commotion. Mrs. Cooper went on to say that Mr. Jackson, the new principal of the M Street High School, was appointed September 12, and her own dismissal "for the good of the service" was made on the 14th.

"I believed that Assistant Supt. Hughes," said Mrs. Cooper, "was opposed to my appointment, but I understood that the bill passed last session had legislated him out of office."

"That is precisely what the committee intended to do," declared Gen. Morrell. "Because of his prejudice and our belief that he could not take an unbiased view, we did not want him to have anything to do with the colored schools." Representative Morrell's remarks were applauded by the colored persons present.

"When you telephoned me and said, 'I'm office, wasn't it prior to the meeting of the board of education?' asked Mr. Oyster of Mrs. Cooper.

"It was not," replied Mrs. Cooper. "You had already appointed Mr. Jackson to the principalship of the M Street High School."

"Didn't I tell you of that position?" asked Mr. Oyster.

"I am very sorry," said Mr. Oyster, "that it has come to be a question of veracity between the two of us."

Gen. Morrell read a part of the school law, Chapter 30, of the District of Columbia, which provided that Mr. Hughes would have been the last person whose advice I would have sought."

Mr. Greene unfolded a letter from Mr. Hughes to the board, giving directions about the cadet battalion.

"Mr. Hughes gives orders here that he had no authority to give," said Mr. Oyster. "He had no such authority."

"Not the slightest," replied Admiral Baird. "I don't believe he wrote such a letter."

"He did," said Mr. Greene with some emphasis. "Here it is."

Mr. Swartzell said he had received a similar letter at the same time from Mr. Hughes. Mrs. Cooper said that when she was dismissed, although she had worked all through the vacation, her dismissal was dated back to June 26, and Admiral Baird explained that this was because of the matter of appropriations for the fiscal year.

James Clark, formerly supervising principal of the colored schools, was dismissed without the formality of a letter of notification, and he had tried to get an interview with Mr. Chancellor, but could not get one, and he had called Chancellor would not see him.

Mr. Clark said that a friend called at Admiral Baird's house to hand him letters which he had written to the board. They were asked to take seats in the parlor, and the admiral met them. He asked them if he should present the letters to the board or open them himself, and they told him to open them.

"That is absolutely false," said Admiral Baird, excitedly.

"It is the truth," said Mr. Clark.

"I was there and saw it," affirmed Mr. Love.

**Dr. Chancellor's Statement.**

Superintendent Chancellor then took the seat at the head of the table and made his statement. He said he had not seen Mrs. Cooper when he appointed her to the head of the Latin department at \$1,500 a year in place of her position at the head of the M Street High School. She had talked with him about the matter three or four hours. When the board would not sanction her reappointment to the M Street school he decided upon the appointment of Mrs. Cooper to the head of the Latin department, and he said: "Dismiss her for the good of the service."

"When did you first broach the subject of another position to her?" asked Gen. Morrell.

"I made her a flat, unconditional promise," said Superintendent Chancellor, "to nominate her as head of the Latin department. I couldn't do anything else. Colored members of the board were opposed to her for anything, while the white members were opposed to her only for the principalship."

"When the examination for the principalship of the M Street High School was decided upon," he said, "Mrs. Cooper's place considered to be vacant."

"We did not know," replied Dr. Chancellor.

"Why were the examinations ordered?" asked Mr. Morrell.

"To protect ourselves in case it was decided to be vacant," replied Dr. Chancellor.

The most dramatic scene in the hearing occurred when Dr. Chancellor stated that in his office he had offered Mr. Clark, the supervising principal, another place.

"Mr. Chairman," said Clark, jumping to his feet, "I never was in Dr. Chancellor's office. To this the superintendent made no reply."

Dr. Chancellor admitted that the school board was not consistent, and said it could not be when it had three legal opinions to go by and all were different. He said he studied the new school law the more conflicts he saw in it.

**NO HOPE FOR BIG SHIP.**

**Navy Department Does Not Expect Authorization from Congress.**

There is but little hope among officials of the Navy Department that Congress will authorize the construction of a national battle ship at this session of Congress. About the most that is expected is action which will make possible the construction of the 20,000-ton ship authorized at the last session of Congress.

Representative Morrell here came in and took up the questioning of the witness. Mr. Greene asked if the board had sought the advice of Assistant District Attorney McNamara when the teachers were dismissed. Mr. Oyster said the board had done so, and Gen. Morrell asked them if Mr. Oyster did not think teachers should

have the benefit of counsel before the board. Mr. Oyster said they ought to when on trial.

## EXPECT NEW MESSAGE

President May Write on Colorado River Break.

## TO HOLD SOUTHERN PACIFIC

Road Said to Completely Control the Development Companies, Notwithstanding Harriman's Statement That It Is Only Interested to the Extent of Holding Stock for Loans.

President Roosevelt is expected to send to Congress within the next week a message dealing with conditions in Southern California, as a result of the break in the Colorado River at a point along that stream where an intake feeds the canal of the California Development Company, which is engaged in the business of supplying water to settlers in the Imperial Valley, on the American side of the border.

About the middle of December the President wired E. H. Harriman to the effect that great distress had been caused among settlers in Southern California due to another break in the Colorado. The President proceeded upon the theory that the California Development Company was a Southern Pacific enterprise, and that as such Harriman exercised a controlling influence in its affairs. Harriman advised the President that the California Development Company was not a Southern Pacific concern; that the Southern Pacific was interested in it only to the extent of holding stock for loans advanced.

Upon this representation, President Roosevelt informed Harriman that he would recommend to Congress that the government assume a part of the cost necessary to repair the break.

**May See Things Differently.**

If a report circulated yesterday is correct, the President has changed his programme. It is understood that in his message to Congress he will present the facts as he now sees them.

It is known that information has been received here showing that the Southern Pacific controls 51 per cent of the stock of the California Development Company, and that this enterprise is willing to let the government pay half the expense of an undertaking that it must enter upon itself in order to maintain its existence.

The Southern Pacific took over the stock of the California Development Company in return for a loan that was advanced to the latter to repair the break in the river which was dangerous, not only to the settlers, but which, if not repaired, would have required the Southern Pacific to again remove its tracks at an enormous expenditure.

Officials here say that it is evident that the development companies must repair the break or go out of business. They are willing, however, that Congress shall make appropriate provisions for the cost of a part of the work. As the development companies are said to be bankrupt, there is no way of getting at them except through the Southern Pacific, and officials expect there will be a full publicity given to the facts the relation of the Southern Pacific Company to the development companies will be revealed.

**May Force Companies to Suspend.**

The chances are that Congress will refuse to authorize the government to embark upon the work of repairing the break in the Colorado River in co-operation with private companies. If the development companies or the Southern Pacific refuse to go it alone they will probably be put out of business by the action of Mexico in withdrawing their charter.

That contingency the United States will repair the break in the river and settlers in Southern California will be supplied with water taken from works that are now being constructed by the government at a point on the river above Yuma, in Arizona.

This subject was considered at a conference held at the White House yesterday. Information concerning the matter in the possession of the United States Geological Survey was submitted to the President by Director Walcott.

**ASKS INCREASE FOR ARMY**

More Money Necessary If Defense Is to Be Maintained.

Chairman Hull Says \$4,000 More Artillerymen Are Needed—Urges Better Rate of Pay.

Pursuant to notice given Monday, the army appropriation bill was taken up by the House in Committee of the Whole yesterday. Mr. Currier, of New Hampshire, in the chair, and Mr. Morrell, of Iowa, in charge of the bill, asked unanimous consent to dispense with its first reading.

Mr. Mann, of Illinois, objected, however, and the clerks proceeded to roll off forty-five pages of bill print.

General discussion was opened by Mr. Hull. He said that the government was to maintain its army of defense a considerable increase in appropriations must be made. Fortifications and coast defenses were going forward at the rate of several millions a year, and it was the intention to continue until the total expenditure, now something over \$100,000,000, had been amounted to \$130,000,000. At present there are not enough men in the Coast Artillery to give one shift of the guns in place. Congress should make the service more attractive in the way of higher wages. Under existing conditions, men enlist, secure valuable experience in engineering and mechanics, and then go into civil life at much higher wages than the government pays. To properly maintain the government's armaments, it would require a force of 40,000 men. Now there are something over 10,000 men. Unless a sufficient force was provided to at least take care of the guns in time of peace, Mr. Hull said, it was useless, and worse, for the government to go on constructing them.

Attention was called to the slight increase proposed by the committee for commutation for quarters. Beginning with three rooms for first lieutenants, an additional room was given to officers of each grade, until nine were reached for general officers, and in lieu of quarters, \$12 a month for each room, instead of \$10, was allowed, making the monthly commutation range from \$36 to \$108 a month.

After Mr. Shuyden had addressed the committee on the Brownsville affair, Mr. Zenor delivered an hour's speech opposing the bill-subsidy bill.

In the opinion of Mr. Gaines, of Tennessee, the fact that the House was considering a bill "making appropriations for the support of the army" on Jackson Day was a coincidence sufficiently striking to warrant him in occupying the time of the House with a long and patriotic address of the hero of New Orleans.

The committee arose when he concluded, and the House adjourned until to-day.

**Channel Disapproved.**

Gen. Mackenzie, chief of the corps of engineers of the army, yesterday transmitted to Congress a report of the board of engineers on rivers and harbors, disapproving the project for a fourteen-foot channel from St. Louis to Chicago.

**Tax on Foreign Insurance.**

Representative Olcott, of New York, yesterday introduced a bill providing for a tax of 2 per cent upon the gross premiums paid to foreign insurance companies doing business in the United States.

**Will Print Publicity Report.**

The Senate, on motion of Mr. Patterson, agreed yesterday to print as a public document the first annual report of the national publicity bill organization.

**Under U. S. Government Control.**

**ADVANTAGES THAT COUNT.**

**3 Per Cent Interest.**

**Absolute Safety.**

**Commercial accounts invited.**

**MERCHANTS & MECHANICS Savings Bank,**

Cor. 7th and G Sts.

## FORTIFICATIONS BILL READY.

Carries \$4,411,000, a Decrease of \$337,000 from the Current Year.

The House Committee on Appropriations yesterday concluded its work on the bill making appropriations for the construction of fortifications and coast defenses for the year ending June 30, 1908. It probably will be reported to-day, and follow the army bill as pending business.

The amount carried by the bill is \$4,411,000, a decrease from the appropriations for the current year of \$337,000. The estimates submitted by the Secretary of War aggregated in round numbers \$4,000,000.

The chief item omitted from the bill was for the creation and fortification of an artificial island between Cape Charles and Henry, at the mouth of Chesapeake Bay, as recommended by the Taft board. The idea of the projectors of the scheme was that the proposed fortification would protect the cities of Baltimore and Washington and surrounding territory at the least expense.

The subcommittee which framed the bill inserted a paragraph for a survey of the location site of the proposed island, but the full committee disapproved entering upon the project, and reference to it disappeared from the bill.

**PHILIPPINE BANK FAVORED.**

**Cornell Professor Recommends Its Establishment.**

The House Committee on Insular Affairs yesterday heard Prof. E. W. Kemmerer, of Cornell University, on the subject of the establishment of an agricultural bank in the Philippines.

Prof. Kemmerer, who is assistant instructor in political economy at Cornell, went to the islands for the purpose of studying the financial needs there.

The scheme of an agricultural bank is similar to the plan followed by England in establishing a bank in Egypt by guaranteeing to the promoters interest upon the investment. Prof. Kemmerer stated that the bank had been successful from the start and that the British government had never been called upon to make good its guarantee.

The committee also heard former Gov. Gen. Ide upon the progress of railroad building in the Philippines.

**LA FOLLETTE BILL OPPOSED**

Criticism Comes from Both Republicans and Democrats.

**Wyoming Employees Protest—Knox Objects to Terminology—Vote Is to Be Taken To-morrow.**

The Senate yesterday briefly considered the La Follette bill which seeks to limit the hours of continuous labor by railroad men to sixteen. Under a previous agreement a vote is to be taken upon it to-morrow. A score of amendments are already pending. A number were offered yesterday, all seeking to permit longer hours of work where it was made necessary by the completion of "runs" by the train crews.

Mr. Warren submitted a large number of protests from engineers and conductors in Wyoming. They declared that the enactment of such legislation would prove a great hardship to railroad men generally, as it would necessitate their change of residence.

Mr. Bacon inquired of Mr. La Follette whether the measure merely limited interstate lines or contemplated supervision over all trains doing an interstate traffic.

Mr. La Follette responded that he would have to investigate the matter. "I will inform the Senate that I did not draw this bill," he declared.

Mr. Bacon retorted that the point would make all the difference in the world to him, because if the latter were true the legislation would affect practically all the railroad lines in the United States.

The Wisconsin Senator later advised him that the measure referred to any common carrier engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. La Follette called attention to that part of the bill which spoke of commerce being hauled. He said that commerce was not a substance, and that the provision as it stood would be void. Mr. Patterson, of California, was so won that it would defeat the very purpose for which it was intended.

Consideration of the bill will be resumed to-day, to which time the Senate adjourned.

**SENATOR ALLISON RETURNS.**

Is in Good Health, Though Showing Signs of Recent Illness.

S Senator Allison, of Iowa, who has been ill at his home in Dubuque, Iowa, since before the close of the last session of Congress, was on the floor of the Senate yesterday for the first time since the session began.

The Iowa Senator was a little paler than usual, as a result of his long illness, but was in better health than his colleagues expected to find him under the circumstances. He was surrounded immediately by his colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, who congratulated him. He at once took up his work actively as chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

**Channel Disapproved.**

Gen. Mackenzie, chief of the corps of engineers of the army, yesterday transmitted to Congress a report of the board of engineers on rivers and harbors, disapproving the project for a fourteen-foot channel from St. Louis to Chicago.

**Tax on Foreign Insurance.**

Representative Olcott, of New York, yesterday introduced a bill providing for a tax of 2 per cent upon the gross premiums paid to foreign insurance companies doing business in the United States.

**Will Print Publicity Report.**

The Senate, on motion of Mr. Patterson, agreed yesterday to print as a public document the first annual report of the national publicity bill organization.

**Under U. S. Government Control.**

**ADVANTAGES THAT COUNT.**

**3 Per Cent Interest.**

**Absolute Safety.**

**Commercial accounts invited.**

**MERCHANTS & MECHANICS Savings Bank,**

Cor. 7th and G Sts.

## CORTEYOU HELD UP

Teller and Daniel Object to His Confirmation.

## FUTURE PLANS UNCERTAIN

Some Democrats Favor Concerted Move to Prevent Confirmation of Appointment as Secretary of Treasury—Senator La Follette May Join Forces with the Minority.

Opposition to the confirmation of George B. Cortelyou's nomination as Secretary of the Treasury developed yesterday in the Senate Committee on Finance when Mr. Cortelyou's case was brought up for action. At the request of Senator Daniel, of Virginia, and Senator Teller, of Colorado, the ranking Democratic members of the committee, consideration of the nomination was postponed for a week.

Neither Senator Daniel nor Senator Teller gave any reason for desiring the postponement, other than that they were not prepared to act in the matter, but it is evident from what was said afterward by some of their party colleagues that the Democrats are considering the advisability of making a concerted effort to prevent Mr. Cortelyou from taking the Treasury portfolio. Their general ground of criticism is that Mr. Cortelyou had indicated dealings with great financial interests when he was chairman of the Republican national campaign committee, and for that reason should not be placed in charge of the finances of the nation, a position in which his relations with these same financial interests would necessarily have to be continued. This is a revival of the old charge that Mr. Cortelyou made the big corporations disgorge large sums for the expenses of the Republican campaign of 1904.

How far the opposition to Mr. Cortelyou has made progress among Democratic Senators is not clear. They have talked freely among themselves, and some have expressed a desire to make a fight. Others, however, are inclined to go slowly, and in the uncertainty that exists as to a course of action, it was deemed advisable by Senators Daniel and Teller to secure postponement of Mr. Cortelyou's nomination for a week in order that they and their colleagues might make up their minds as to a plan of procedure.

**Notice Served Last Week.**

Mr. Daniel and Mr. Teller served notice last week on the Republican members of the finance committee that they would oppose a favorable report on Mr. Cortelyou's case as long as he retained the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee, and if the nomination were reported while he still held the chairmanship, they would make a determined fight in the Senate against confirmation.

It seemed when Mr. Cortelyou retired from the house of the Republican political organization that the opposition to him had disappeared, but the Democrats, or some of them, evidently believe that the opportunity to secure advantage from further opposition is too good to lose.

So far only one Republican Senator has shown signs of siding with the Democrats in the proposed fight against Mr. Cortelyou. He is Mr. La Follette, of Wisconsin, whose political colleagues are looking askance to his claim to being a member of the dominant faction, and may find reason for taking some action from the house of the Republican political organization that the opposition to him had disappeared, but the Democrats, or some of them, evidently believe that the opportunity to secure advantage from further opposition is too good to lose.

Mr. Daniel said he is not a partisan of the President, and often differs with him, but in this matter the Executive has his hearty approval. At the same time, he desired to obtain all possible facts, whether their bearing be on constitutional or legal rights.

The articles of war were then taken up by Mr. Daniel and analyzed to show that while in early years they prohibited the President from ordering summary discharges, they have been repeatedly modified, until that right is now clearly given. Complete authority, he said, is given the President, the Secretary of War, and the commanding officer in the field. He also reviewed the army regulations showing they were framed and promulgated under the authority of Congress.

The Congress, he said, gave the President the right to make and enforce these regulations. Cases were cited in which decisions have upheld this contention.

The Virginia Senator held that it would be curious to find any authority disputing the power of the President to sever the relations of a private soldier with the army, according to his discretion and judgment. He explained the question of enlistment as a rope with a hard knot at the soldier's end, and a bowknot at the end held by the President and the War Department.

**Authorities May Dissolve.**

"The authorities may dissolve the relation at a moment's notice," he declared. He said some of these dismissals might operate as a hardship to the soldier, but more often to his advantage. The history of American military law presented no case, he asserted, in which the President was required to keep in the army a soldier in whom he had lost confidence.

"What's the use of discussing whether the President, as commander-in-chief, had power to act as he did, in discharging the troops?" the Senator asked. "There is ample power given him by Congress."

He said that a refusal by the President to exercise the right of summary dismissal would be a curtailment of his power, and that it would be a charge that uttered upon the other side of the chamber," he exclaimed. "Some have delicately hinted that he is attempting to extend his power beyond the limits which they prescribe as the limit of them."

The Senator declared that this was no racial question. "God forbid," he exclaimed, "that the people of the United States will raise a racial question when it is possible to avoid it."

He said he had no prejudice against the colored troops, and that there would be no Senator who would not protest, if he thought an injustice had been done to them. "It is not the color of a soldier's skin which gives him any right to create disorder," he declared.

He said the colored man should be made to understand that obedience was the first duty of a soldier, no matter what the color of his skin, and that those who do not obey orders should feel the punishment provided.

"If this had been a white regiment that had been dismissed," declared the Senator, "there would have been no public meeting in the street, no sermon preached, no churches aroused, and no diverted from their religious devotions." He did not wonder that the colored people were sensitive over what had been done, because they have been taught that the soldiers were treated unjustly. He contended that the President had acted as mildly and moderately as he could under the circumstances. The people of the South stood for law and order, he declared, and for the recognition of the officials of the government when they acted within the powers, which they had done in this case.

**Mr. Slayden's Argument.**